



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/812,305	03/19/2001	Richard D. Nearhood	31363.003 (formerly 69305)	2243
27887	7590	11/19/2003	EXAMINER	
FENNEMORE CRAIG 3003 NORTH CENTRAL AVENUE SUITE 2600 PHOENIX, AZ 85012			BUCHANAN, CHRISTOPHER R	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3627	

DATE MAILED: 11/19/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/812,305

Applicant(s)

NEARHOOD ET AL.

Examiner

Christopher R Buchanan

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 September 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____. 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hough alone.

With regard to claim 1, Hough discloses a system for managing property tax information for a plurality of real estate parcels (see abstract) that includes a data storage device (inherent in computer system), an output device (15, 16, Fig. 1), and a processor (14), wherein the data storage device maintains a database (17, 18) of property tax data for a plurality of parcel records each record including an identifier for identifying particular parcels (20, Fig. 2, col. 6 line 42+, HN, Fig. 4), a tax year identifier (Y, Fig. 4, inherent in the system), and a means for identifying the geographic location of the parcel (col. 1 line 65+, col. 4 line 14). The storage device maintains a plurality of templates (see Figs. 5-13, common practice in the art) that define applicable tax rules (see Figs. 2, 3, 7, 14) and that are connected to a master record for the parcel (col. 4 line 25+). The processor receives requests for particular parcel records (20, 22, 24, Fig. 2), automatically retrieves a template (col. 6 line 26+), generates the requested report using the template, and outputs the report to an output device (col. 4 line 28+). With

Art Unit: 3627

regard to claim 2, the plurality of templates includes a template for calculating property tax (see Figs. 3 and 9). With regard to claims 3-9, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the templates could include a number of varieties for different purposes, including determining valuation, appeals, payment plans, etc., and that the processor would select the most appropriate template for the given situation.

3. Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hough alone.

With regard to claim 10, Hough discloses a method for managing property tax information for a plurality of taxing jurisdictions (see abstract) that includes maintaining a data storage device (inherent in computer system), an output device (15, 16, Fig. 1), and a processor (14), wherein the data storage device maintains a database (17, 18) of property tax data for a plurality of parcel records each record including an identifier for identifying particular parcels (20, Fig. 2, col. 6 line 42+, HN, Fig. 4), a tax year identifier (Y, Fig. 4, inherent in the system), and a means for identifying the geographic location of the parcel (col. 1 line 65+, col. 4 line 14). The storage device maintains a plurality of templates (see Figs. 5-13, common practice in the art) that define applicable tax rules (see Figs. 2, 3, 7, 14) and that are connected to a master record for the parcel (col. 4 line 25+). The processor receives requests for particular parcel records (20, 22, 24, Fig. 2), automatically retrieves a template (col. 6 line 26+), generates the requested report using the template, and outputs the report to an output device (col. 4 line 28+). With regard to claim 11, the plurality of templates includes a template for calculating property

tax (see Figs. 3 and 9). With regard to claims 12-18, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the templates could include a number of varieties for different purposes, including determining valuation, appeals, payment plans, etc., and that the processor would select the most appropriate template for the given situation.

4. Claims 19-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hough alone.

With regard to claim 19, Hough discloses a system for managing property tax information for a plurality of real estate parcels (see abstract) with a computer readable medium having stored thereon a database (17, 18) of property tax data for a plurality of parcel records each record including an identifier for identifying particular parcels (20, Fig. 2, col. 6 line 42+, HN, Fig. 4), a tax year identifier (Y, Fig. 4, inherent in the system), and a means for identifying the geographic location of the parcel (col. 1 line 65+, col. 4 line 14). The medium maintains a plurality of templates (see Figs. 5-13, common practice in the art) that define applicable tax rules (see Figs. 2, 3, 7, 14) and that are connected to a master record for the parcel (col. 4 line 25+). With regard to claim 20, the plurality of templates includes a template for calculating property tax (see Figs. 3 and 9). With regard to claims 21-26, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the templates could include a number of varieties for different purposes, including determining valuation, appeals, payment plans, naming conventions, and so on.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed September 11, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the recited elements of the independent claims are not disclosed by the reference Hough. The examiner, however, stands by the rejection and contends that the elements of the claimed invention are disclosed by Hough, as outlined in the rejection above. Applicant argues, in particular, that Hough does not disclose a template as claimed, which is a set of rules for processing data and not the data itself. It appears that the templates disclosed by Hough in Figs. 5-13 allow users to input data and, then, perform calculations based upon the applicable rules. Such templates are well-known and widely used in the art and it would be obvious to one skilled in the art that a template could have a variety of designs and would include the rules necessary to perform the task for which it is created.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3627

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher R Buchanan whose telephone number is 703-306-5782. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 9-7.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Olszewski can be reached on 703-308-5183. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

CRB

Christopher Buchanan
November 14, 2003



11/17/03

ROBERT P. OLSZEWSKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600